



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,343	01/31/2001	D. Rich Lang	44PAO300	5981

26882 7590 02/13/2003

ROBERT R. WATERS, ESQ.
WATERS LAW OFFICE, PLLC
633 SEVENTH STREET
HUNTINGTON, WV 25701

EXAMINER

FRIDIE JR, WILLMON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/773,343

Applicant(s)

Lang

Examiner

Willmon Fridie

Art Unit

3722



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 21, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Esslinger.

Esslinger discloses all of the subject matter as set forth in the claims and is identical to the invention as broadly recited and inherently teaches the method as set forth.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was

Art Unit:

made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 10,11 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esslinger.

In regard to claims 15 and 16 it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the indicia in the claimed areas, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Esslinger discloses the claimed invention except for the specific materials in claim 10. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill level of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In regard to claims 13 and 14, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a loose leaf binder mechanism or a conventional binding, since applicant has not disclosed that these claimed bindings solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the invention would perform equally well with or without them.

5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esslinger in view of Weinger.

Art Unit:

Esslinger discloses the claimed invention except for pages and covers formed of different lengths thereby forming a tabbed effect. Weinger teaches that it is well known in the art to use pages and covers formed of different lengths thereby forming a tabbed effect in a book binding assembly. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Esslinger with pages and covers formed of different lengths thereby forming a tabbed effect in the manner as taught by Weinger in order to make it easier for the user to access information.

In regard to claims 1, 7 and 8 it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed indicia located in the claimed areas since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack* 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of indicia does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability.

Esslinger discloses the claimed invention except for the specific materials in claim 2. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill level of a worker

Art Unit:

in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In regard to claims 5 and 6, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a loose leaf binder mechanism or a conventional binding, since applicant has not disclosed that these claimed bindings solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the invention would perform equally well with or without them.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office actions directly into the Group...***Official- (703)872-9302...After Final-(703) 872 9303***. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3700 will be promptly forward to the examiner.

Art Unit:

Any inquiries concerning issues other than the substantive content of this and previous communications, such as missing references or filed papers not acknowledged, should be directed to the Customer Service Representative, Tech Center 3700, (703) 306-5648.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W. Fridie, Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 308-1866.



WILLMON FRIDIE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

wf

February 8, 2003